DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 090 HE 022 110

AUTHOR Boone, Jerry N.; And Others
TITLE University Autonomy: Actual and Preferred Location of Authority. ASHE 1988 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (St. Louis, MO, November 3-6, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Centralization; *College Administration; College Faculty; College Students; *Decision Making; Governance; Governing Boards; Higher Education; *Institutional Autonomy; Legislators; National Surveys; *Policy Formation; *Power Structure; Public Colleges; Questionnaires; State Action; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

A study is presented to determine (1) where people influential in public university governance believe various typical decisions are being made and (2) where they believe those decisions should be made. The kinds of issues that bring about most disagreement as to proper authority in governance and administration are identified. Centralization of authority at the state level and loss of control over university operations are common complaints of faculty and administrators. A national survey of people involved in university governance and administration, inside and outside the institution, solicited judgments about ideal and actual authority lines. A questionnaire containing 50 typical university decisions (financial, academic, faculty, student, and administrative) was distributed to two universities per state. Those studied were from five levels of public university authority (faculty, presidents, governing boards, coordinating agencies, and legislators). As a whole, the sample exhibited great satisfaction about decision authority; however, information about current decision practices differs from one group of respondents to another. In all decision areas, presidents and faculty want more authority at the campus level than they believe they have at present; all external groups, particularly legislators, want less authority at the campus level in all areas. Legislative involvement is a controversial point. The "Study of the Location of Higher Education Decisions" questionnaire is attached. Contains 7 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303090

UNIVERSITY AUTONOMY: ACTUAL AND PREFERRED LOCATION OF AUTHORITY

Jerry N. Boone, Memphis State University

Sue Peterson, Northern Arizona University

Dan Poje, Memphis State University

Mel Scarlett, Memphis State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 022 110

ASHE ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Adam's Mark Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri, November 3-6, 1988. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

University Autonomy: Actual and Preferred Location of Authority

Objectives

This study sought to determine (1) where people who are influential in public university governance believe various typical decisions are being made and (2) where they believe those decisions should be made. It attempted to identify the kinds of issues which bring about most disagreement as to proper authority in governance and administration.

Perspective

There is considerable difference of opinion about the amount of autonomy public colleges and universities ought to have. This is a source of tension and frustration among faculty, campus administrators, governing boards, and state officials. Most observers feel that agencies beyond the campus exercise more authority now than they did in earlier years; that, in efforts to assure public accountability, they restrict the flexibility of faculty and campus administrators.

Newman's recent book (1988) surveys the scope and seriousness of the problem and speaks of "bureaucratic ideological and political intrusion" interfering with basic campus functions. In its Control of the Campus (1982), the Carnegie Foundation also describes the changes which occurred in the 1970's.

> State budget officers and legislative oversight committees tightened their control over fiscal and administrative responsibilities traditionally controlled by presidents, vice presidents and deans. State coordinating officers turned to the review of academic programs, a function historically controlled by faculty and accrediting associations (p. 39).

Millett (1984) reports that campus administrators criticize the current situation, complaining that institutions have lost their independence to state system offices. He attributes growing control by state government to poor financial conditions and a loss of public concern for higher education.

Centralization of authority at the state level and loss of control over university operations are among the most common complaints of faculty and administrators alike, although, as Volkwein (1987) points out in his review of research on autonomy, the effects of centralization are not well demonstrated.

Just where are the day-to-day decisions being made for public institutions? The Carnegie Foundation (1982) surveyed presidents of state four-year and two-year schools and the heads of state higher education agencies. They were asked to consider 39 representative decisions and to choose, from among 12 possible locations, that location at which effective authority for each rested. The decisions were grouped under th e categories: academic, personnel, and administrative. Most decisions in all

three categories were reported to be made at the local campus level or by a governing board. The majority of those made elsewhere were in the hands of state coordinating agencies and had to do with mission, program approval, and hiring and enrollment goals. The study did not ascertain whether or not those who responded felt the decision authority was placed properly and, if not, where it should be. Nonetheless, the Foundation warned against undue oversight and regulation which might reduce both efficiency and effectiveness.

As Volkwein points out in his analysis of the Carnegie survey (1986), the issue of centralized control of universities is addressed more through opinion than through analytical data. Perhaps the complaints are a reflection of generalized discontent rather than actual disagreement as to where operating decisions are, and should be, made.

This study utilized a national sample of people who are involved in university governance and administration, both inside and outside the institution. It solicited their judgments as to where authority lies for some typical, everyday decisions and where that authority ideally should lie. It allowed a comparison of the judgments of various kinds of participants in governance and administration and, thus, a picture of how much basic disagreement exists.

Method

Questionnaire. Rather than to ask the respondents to judge where particular kinds of decisions, such as financial decisions, are made, we gave common examples of such decisions and asked for judgments about each. A questionnaire was constructed, containing 50 typical university decisions, grouped as either financial, academic, faculty, student, or administrative. They had been selected and worded from literature and by "brainstorming" among the authors who had experience in university administration and governance. Although not by design, the decision examples used in the questionnaire included practically all of the checklist items suggested by Curry and Fischer (1986) as those to be used in assessing the authority relationship between the campus and the state. The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate, for each decision, the location where it effectively is made and the location where it should be made. They chose locations from among five; "local," "governing board," "coordinating board," "legislature" and "other." Pilot questionnaires were distributed to people who had experiences like those of the respondents but would not be in the survey sample. Their suggestions for change were incorporated into the final questionnaire, which is in Appendix A.

Respondents. The sample studied was selected from five levels of public university authority: faculty, presidents, governing boards, coordinating agencies, and legislators. For

each state two universities were selected (except Wyoming with only one); the principal Carnegie category I university and a second randomly selected from the Carnegie category IIA institutions. If the second institution was governed by the same board as the principal university, and another governing board operated in the state, another institution was selected. A questionnaire was sent to the president of each, with another questionnaire to be passed along to the head of the faculty senate. Each institution was matched with its governing board so that the executive officer of the board was sent a questionnaire and one for the board chairman. In those states with a coordinating agency, its executive officer received a questionnaire and another to be passed along to the chairman of that body. Finally, in each state, the chairmen of the house and senate (or joint) education committees were sent questionnaires.

Results

Four hundred ninety-one questionnaires were mailed. The 251 who responded included 60 percent of the presidents, 59 percent of the faculty senate heads, 55 percent of the governing board executives, 56 percent of the governing board members, 48 percent of the coordinating board executives, 45 percent of the coordinating board m bers, and 30 percent of the legislators. Some of them included comments about the subject with their questionnaire responses. All 50 states yielded responses.

The responses were analyzed by combining all of the items within each decision group (financial, academic, etc.). In addition, the responses of governing board executives were combined with those of governing board members and those of coordinating agency executives with those of coordinating agency members.

Decision location. Table I displays the results in terms of percentages of judgments. These were made up of the number of items in a group of decisions (example: 12 financial decisions) times the number of respondents in a category (example: 50 presidents). Thus, 600 judgments (12 x 50) were made by presidents relative to the current location of financial decisions and that entry in Table I depicts the percentage of their judgments which fell into each decision location. The "other" location was used by so few respondents that it was eliminated from analysis.

Insert Table 1 about here

---

1. Viewing the study as a whole, the respondents believed that most decisions are, and ought to be, made on the campus. This was most true of faculty and student decisions and least true of financial decisions.

2. Again viewing the study as a whole, the governing board is seen as second only to the local institution as the place where decisions are, and ought to be, made. This is particularly the case with financial decisions. In this area, the "external" respondents (all except faculty and presidents) preferred that decisions be made by the governing board rather than at the campus level.
3. All external respondent groups preferred that fewer decisions be made at the campus level in all decision categories. Their preference for moving decisions away from the campus was strongest in the academic area.
4. In all decision areas, those respondents most favoring campus decisions were either faculty or presidents.
5. In all decision areas, presidents and faculty felt that decisions should be more local than they are at present. This preference was strongest in the financial area.
6. In all decision areas except administrative, governing board people would prefer to be more involved than they are now.
7. In all decision areas, coordinating board people would increase the decision-making role of governing boards but never their own. They were the only group which never would increase their own role.

8. In all decision areas, legislators would have fewer of them made on the campus than any other group of respondents and, in all areas, governing board people were next to legislators in denying decision power to the campus.

9. In all decision areas, legislators would place more decisions at the legislative level than would any other respondent group. [illegible]ators are the only group that would place more de[illegible]sions in the hands of legislators than presently are being handled there, particularly administrative decisions. All other groups would prefer that legislative authority be reduced in all decision areas.

Satisfaction. The data also provided an opportunity to determine whether a respondent was "satisfied" or "dissatisfied" with the current location of a particular decision and, if dissatisfied, whether the preferred location would be "lower" (toward the campus) or "higher" (toward the legislature). If a respondent checked the same location as both current and preferred site for a decision, satisfaction was inferred. Locations were ordered from lower to higher as follows: local, governing board, coordinating board, legislature.

Each item was examined to see whether the respondent's judgment of the preferred location was: (1) the same as that of the current location (correct), lower, or higher. These findings,

like those in Table 1, were recorded as percentages of the total number of judgments made by a respondent group in a decision category. The results are shown in Table 2. Asterisks identify these instances in which the percentages of higher and lower preferences were significantly ($p<.05$) different from one another.

Insert Table 2 about here

---

1. The majority of respondents were satisfied with the current location of decision making in all areas. The lowest level of satisfaction was among faculty in the financial decision area.
2. Student decisions had the higher overall level of satisfaction. Financial decisions had the lowest overall level of satisfaction.
3. In all decision areas except student decisions, external respondents expressed more satisfaction with the location than did campus respondents.
4. When not satisfied with decision location, campus respondents (presidents and faculty) showed a clear preference for a lower decision level. These preferences all were significant.

5. When not satisfied with decisions location, most external respondents thought the decisions should be made at a higher level. But this tendency was not as consistent as the opposite tendency among campus respondents.

Agreement. The degree of agreement among the judgments within each respondent group and among the judgments of all respondents were evaluated by means of the Kappa coefficient (Cohen, 1960). Only the judgments of respondents who addressed every item in a particular decision area were included in the analyses. This is shown in Table 3 for current decision locations and in Table 4 for preferred decision locations. Single asterisks mark these coefficients which are significantly below .05 and double asterisks for those significantly below .01.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

---

1. Many coefficients of agreement were statistically significant even though of low order of magnitude.
2. There was least agreement concerning financial decisions and most concerning faculty decisions. This was true with respect to both actual current decision locations and preferred decision locations.
3. Within respondent groups, the greatest consistency was found among legislators and faculty, the two most extreme groups.

4. The highest level of agreement for any decision area was among presidents when expressing their judgment about the proper location for decisions concerning faculty.

Conclusions

We were surprised somewhat at the amount of satisfaction about decision authority exhibited by this sample. But we also were surprised at the extent to which information about current decision practices differs from one group of respondents to another. Generally, off-campus people attribute more current decision authority to governing boards than do campus people. Presidents see themselves making more financial decisions than legislators believe they make. And legislators believe themselves to have decision authority to a greater extent than other respondent groups believe. Possibly this kind of disagreement derives from state-to-state differences in policies or practice; no comparisons of this kind were made, although the data would permit limited within-state analysis to look for agreement among people who have a lot of regulations in common. But it is also possible that the regulations and practices are not understood the same by all, that one level or another in the hierarchy is blamed, or credited, for decisions which really are made elsewhere. Accountability runs in more than one direction, and displacement of unpopular decisions does occur.

One thing which is clear is that state government beyond the level of the governing board seldom is involved in routine decisions affecting the universities, as discovered earlier in the Carnegie Foundation's survey (1982). Despite the prevalence of complaints about outside intrusion into the tradition autonomy of pubic universities, little discontent was expressed through this study, even by presidents and faculty. When given an opportunity to suggest that the authority for decisions was misplaced, they seldom did so. And those external groups who are thought to believe that the institutions have too much power over their own actions did not display that attitude greatly in their responses.

Observations about preferences for change in decision practices must be viewed cautiously because they lie against a background of considerable demonstrated satisfaction. Judgments about desired changes come from relatively few respondents. However, it is noteworthy that, in all decision areas, presidents and faculty want more authority at the campus level than they believe they have at present; their strongest enthusiasm for this kind of change was in the financial area. Conversely, all external groups, particularly legislators, want less authority at the campus level in all areas. Legislative involvement is a quite controversial point. While the legislators want to be more active in university decisions, particularly administrative ones, all other groups want legislative authority decreased. While no decision area stands out as being a source of great

dissatisfaction, there is slightly more enthusiasm for change in the location of authority for financial and academic decisions than for the other areas.

Several potential analyses of the data from this study are beyond the scope of this paper. The individual decision items need to be examined to determine whether any of them are disproportionately a source of desire for a change in the location of authority. Since it seems reasonable that Carnegie Category IIA universities perceive less autonomy than their "flagship" counterparts, an analysis comparing the two groups might be revealing. Finally, a state-by-state analysis in terms of Volkwein's (1987) classification of states by degree of centralization would be of interest.

This study did not yield examples of vigorously disputed territory in university decision authority, as experience and reading had led us to expect. Perhaps there is more rhetoric than substance in the complaints. Perhaps the discontent is due more to the manner in which authority is exercised than to its location. Or perhaps it is due to the rapid rate at which authority is said to be moving away from the campus, an uncomfortable disturbance in the status quo.

References

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The Control of the Campus. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Cohen, J. "A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales." Educational and Psychological Measurement 20 (1986): 37-46.

Curry, D. J., and N. M. Fischer. "Public Higher Education and the State: Models for Financing, Budgeting, and Accountability." Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education annual meeting, San Antonio, February, 1986. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 268 886.)

Millett, John D. Conflict in Higher Education: State Government vs. Institutional Independence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Newman, F. Choosing Quality: Reducing Conflict between the State and the University. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1987.

Volkwein, J. F. "Campus Autonomy and Its Relationship to Measures of University Quality." The Journal of Higher Education 57, no. 5 (1986): 510-28.

Volkwein, J. F. "State Regulations and Campus Autonomy." In Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research edited by John C. Smart, Vol. III. New York: Agathon Press, 1987.

TABLE 1

Percent of Judgments Indicating the Current (C) and Preferred (P) Location of Decisions

Financial Decisions Locations

Respondents	Local C %	Local P %	Gov. Board C %	Gov. Board P %	Coord. Board C %	Coord. Board P %	Legislature C %	Legislature P %
Legislators	30.9	28.7	42.9	41.4	14.5	16.2	10.9	13.0
CBE&M	48.0	47.0	43.8	49.5	1.7	1.1	4.2	1.3
GB&M	35.5	34.9	48.2	51.5	5.4	7.7	6.3	2.5
Presidents	54.9	65.4	32.8	30.2	3.8	2.0	5.4	1.6
Faculty	49.0	62.5	32.1	30.9	8.8	4.9	7.7	1.4

Academic Decision Locations

Respondents	Local C %	Local P %	Gov. Board C %	Gov. Board P %	Coord. Board C %	Coord. Board P %	Legislature C %	Legislature P %
Legislators	51.3	43.8	30.1	31.9	17.4	22.2	1.2	2.1
CB&M	71.6	71.4	21.5	23.8	5.8	4.4	.6	.2
GB&M	58.7	50.6	26.3	28.2	13.9	21.0	1.0	.1
Presidents	73.4	79.2	17.4	16.5	7.7	3.9	.9	.3
Faculty	71.0	76.6	13.6	11.2	11.7	9.3	1.1	.4

Table 1 (cont.)

Faculty Decision Locations

Respondents	Local C %	Local P %	Gov. Board C %	Gov. Board P %	Coord. Board C %	Coord. Board P %	Legislature C %	Legislature P %
Legislators	72.5	69.2	25.3	26.7	1.1	2.3	1.1	1.2
CB&M	85.1	84.4	14.2	15.6	0.0	0.0	.5	0.0
GBE&M	73.3	70.0	25.4	28.8	.4	.8	0.0	0.0
Presidents	83.6	89.3	14.1	10.5	.6	.3	0.0	0.0
Faculty	79.5	91.4	14.7	6.7	3.3	1.1	.3	0.0

Student Decision Locations

Respondents	Local C %	Local P %	Gov. Board C %	Gov. Board P %	Coord. Board C %	Coord. Board P %	Legislature C %	Legislature P %
Legislators	73.8	68.8	21.5	25.7	3.4	2.8	1.3	2.8
CBE&M	93.9	93.2	4.7	5.4	.3	.3	0.0	0.0
GBE&M	82.1	75.6	16.8	21.8	.5	2.0	0.0	0.0
Presidents	90.5	94.2	7.1	4.1	1.0	.7	.7	.3
Faculty	87.4	90.3	6.3	4.7	1.7	1.3	1.7	1.3

Administrative Decision Locations

Respondents	Local C %	Local P %	Gov. Board C %	Gov. Board P %	Coord. Board C %	Coord. Board P %	Legislature C %	Legislature P %
Legislators	43.4	39.6	38.9	36.4	13.2	15.0	3.8	8.2
CBE&M	71.5	69.8	23.1	26.6	2.0	1.6	2.0	1.3
GBE&M	50.4	49.1	38.3	36.8	5.7	9.5	2.6	2.3
Presidents	72.1	77.6	22.1	20.0	2.8	1.2	1.2	.9
Faculty	67.1	75.0	20.4	16.9	6.6	4.5	3.1	2.3

TABLE 2

Percent of Judgments Indicating That Decisions Should be Made at Their Current Level, Lower Level, or Higher Level

Financial Decisions

Decision Level	External Respondents LEG. %	CBE&M %	GBE&M %	Campus Respondents Presidents %	Faculty %	(Total) %
Lower	1.8	5.0*	5.3*	12.5*	18.8*	9.6*
Correct	91.8	91.7	91.9	86.5	79.1	87.6
Higher	9.5*	3.3	2.9	1.0	2.0	2.8

Academic Decisions

Decision Level	External Respondents LEG. %	CBE&M %	GBE&M %	Campus Respondents Presidents %	Faculty %	(Total) %
Lower	2.1	3.3	2.5	9.5*	10.2*	6.0*
Correct	87.9	94.2	84.6	88.9	86.8	89.1
Higher	10.1*	2.4	12.9*	1.6	3.0	4.9

Faculty Decisions

Decision Level	External Respondents LEG. %	CBE&M %	GBE&M %	Campus Respondents Presidents %	Faculty %	(Total) %
Lower	1.8	1.2	1.7	5.2*	11.7*	4.6
Correct	92.4	96.2	92.9	94.8	87.5	92.9
Higher	5.8*	2.6*	5.5*	0.0	0.9	2.4

Table 2 (cont.)

Student Decisions

Decision Level	External Respondents LEG. %	CBE&M %	GBE&M %	Campus Respondents Presidents %	Faculty %	(Total) %
Lower	2.1	.6	Ø.Ø	4.1*	4.8*	2.4*
Correct	88.9	98.3	93.3	95.5	93.5	94.7
Higher	9.Ø*	1.1*	6.7*	Ø.3	1.7	2.8

Administrative Decisions

Decision Level	External Respondents LEG. %	CBE&M %	GBE&M %	Campus Respondents Presidents %	Faculty %	(Total) %
Lower	Ø.4	1.7	2.1	6.5*	9.7*	4.5*
Correct	89.9	95.2	91.2	92.4	88.5	91.8
Higher	9.7*	3.1*	6.6*	1.1	1.8	3.6

TABLE 3

Kappa Coefficients of Agreement Concerning Current Decision Locations by Decision Area and by Respondent Groups

Respondents	Financial 12 items	Academic 17 items	Faculty 6 items	Student 6 items	Administrative 10 items
	Decision Areas				
Legislators					
Kappa	.178	.257*	.353*	.429**	.342*
Number	26	27	28	29	19
Coordinating Board Exec. and Members					
Kappa	.176	.118	.269**	.071	.169
Number	51	67	70	69	53
Governing Board Exec. and Members					
Kappa	.122	.126	.321*	.318*	.098
Number	26	37	38	37	30
Presidents					
Kappa	.127	.125	.358**	.080	.121
Number	42	51	57	56	28
Faculty					
Kappa	.141	.175*	.378**	.216*	.268*
Number	43	49	58	52	31
Total					
Kappa	.175**	.172**	.344**	.268**	.220**
Number	188	231	246	243	161

TABLE 4

Kappa Coefficients of Agreement Concerning Preferred Decision Locations by Decision Areas and by Respondent Groups

Respondents	Financial 12 items	Academic 17 items	Faculty 6 items	Student 6 items	Administrative 10 items
	Decision Areas				
Legislators					
Kappa	.166	.219	.325*	.351*	.364**
Number	24	26	26	28	19
Coordinating Board Exec. and Members					
Kappa	.167	.140	.303**	.116	.188
Number	54	67	69	67	54
Governing Board Exec. and Members					
Kappa	.188	.180	.392**	.365**	.137
Number	30	40	39	38	30
Presidents					
Kappa	.124	.111	.475**	.099	.123
Number	53	55	59	56	35
Faculty					
Kappa	.129	.190*	.373**	.208*	.171
Number	48	50	56	53	34
Total					
Kappa	.199**	.212**	.399**	.317**	.239**
Number	209	238	249	242	172

Study of the Location of Higher Education Decisions

Center for the Study of Higher Education
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38152

STUDY OF THE LOCATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DECISIONS

The purpose of this study is to determine the decisions most likely to generate conflict among the various constituencies involved in governing public higher education. Where are these decisions **now** being made? Where do informed and concerned people believe these decisions **should** be made? Please answer all of the questions after reading the definitions of the terms below.

If you wish to comment on any question or qualify your answers, please feel free to use the space in the margins and on the back cover. Your comments will be read and taken into account. All responses will be treated with strict confidence.

Thank you for your help.

Terms Used in This Study

Decision Location — For this study, *Decision Location* is the point at which the decision is usually made with confidence it will not be changed at a higher level. Final legal authority for many decisions may lie officially in one place. But, in practice, decisions often are made at a lower level without serious review at the higher level.

Local Institution — Official or organization of a public four-year college or university, e.g., faculty senate, registrar, president.

Governing Board — Elected or appointed body primarily responsible for a single institution or system of institutions, e.g., regents or trustees, or the executive officer of that body acting in its name.

Coordinating Board — Statewide body with some responsibilities for ALL public colleges and universities, or the executive officer of that body acting in its name.

Other — Any person or office not listed, e.g., governor.

LOCATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DECISIONS

Listed below are 50 types of decisions which might be made at the local college or university, or at one of several outside agencies. At what level is each decision type CURRENTLY made and at what level SHOULD it be made?

1 means **LOCAL** college or university	3 means state **COORDINATING** board
2 means **GOVERNING** board	4 means **LEGISLATURE**
5 means **OTHER** (specify in margin)	

PART I. FINANCIAL DECISIONS	CURRENTLY LOCATED (Write number in box)	SHOULD BE LOCATED (Write number in box)
1. Determination of faculty and administrative staff salaries, including performance pay		
2. Transfer of funds between accounts within institution		
3. Use of carry-over funds from one year to the next		
4. Setting of tuition and fees		
5. Determination of auxiliary enterprises to be operated		
6. Acquisition and disposal of assets, including real estate		
7. Use of gifts to the institution (money and property)		
8. Selection of architects and contractors for major construction		
9. Approval of research and service contracts		

1 means **LOCAL** college or university	3 means state **COORDINATING** board
2 means **GOVERNING** board	4 means **LEGISLATURE**
5 means **OTHER** (specify in margin)	

PART I. cont. FINANCIAL DECISIONS	**CURRENTLY LOCATED** (Write number in box)	**SHOULD BE LOCATED** (Write number in box)
10. Determination of what the institution's budget request will be		
11. Approval of institution's plan for allocation of its budget		
12. Development of financial exigency plan		
PART II. ACADEMIC DECISIONS		
13. Creation and termination of programs of study (degrees and majors)		
14. Creation and termination of options within majors (submajors)		
15. Extension to off-campus locations		
16. Creation of new administrative units		
17. Establishment and revision of admission requirements		
18. Establishment and revision of graduation requirements		
19. Acceptance of transfer credit		

1 means **LOCAL** college or university
2 means **GOVERNING** board
3 means state **COORDINATING** board
4 means **LEGISLATURE**
5 means **OTHER** (specify in margin)

PART II. cont. ACADEMIC DECISIONS	**CURRENTLY LOCATED** (Write number in box)	**SHOULD BE LOCATED** (Write number in box)
20. Determination of course numbering system		
21. Determination of number of credit hours required for degree		
22. Determination of general education requirements		
23. Determination of highest degree to be offered at the institution (bachelor's, master's, doctorate)		
24. Establishment of remedial/developmental programs		
25. Establishment of academic calendar		
26. Awarding of graduate assistantships and fellowships		
27. Identification of measures to be used with graduating students to evaluate quality of institution's programs		
28. Establishment of dissertation and thesis standards		
29. Determination of academic standards for athletes (other than NCAA)		

1 means **LOCAL** college or university
2 means **GOVERNING** board
3 means state **COORDINATING** board
4 means **LEGISLATURE**
5 means **OTHER** (specify in margin)

PART III. FACULTY DECISIONS	**CURRENTLY LOCATED** (Write number in box)	**SHOULD BE LOCATED**
30. Awarding of tenure		
31. Awarding of promotions		
32. Hiring and dismissal of non-tenured faculty		
33. Awarding sabbatical leaves		
34. Determination of teaching loads		
35. Determination of faculty research requirements		
PART IV. STUDENT DECISIONS		
36. Determination of disciplinary actions for use of controlled substances on campus (including alcohol)		
37. Determination of campus living arrangements (such as coed dorms)		
38. Determination of final grade upon appeal		
39. Determination of grounds for explusion		

1 means **LOCAL** college or university
2 means **GOVERNING** board
3 means state **COORDINATING** board
4 means **LEGISLATURE**
5 means **OTHER** (specify in margin)

PART IV. cont. STUDENT DECISIONS	**CURRENTLY LOCATED** (Write number in box)	**SHOULD BE LOCATED**
40. Determination of health requirements for admission and retention		
PART V. ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS		
41. Approval of administrative staff hiring and termination		
42. Development of institutional mission statement		
43. Development of long-range plans		
44. Approval for use of campus facilities (other than for instruction)		
45. Establishment of employee health requirements		
46. Establishment of sick and maternity leaves		
47. Negotiation with union representatives		
48. Approval of general and early retirements		
49. Determination of faculty and administrative staff evaluation procedures		
50. Approval of out-of-country travel		

Additional comments? Please use the back page.

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the location of higher education decisions? If so, please use this space for that purpose.

Your contribution to this effort is greatly appreciated. If you would like a summary of the results, please print your name and address on the back of the return envelope (NOT this questionnaire). We will see that you get it.

PS 2/87-1373

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action University